

### REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on May 4, 2010, the Examiner rejected claims 11 – 18. With this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 11, 12, 14, and 16 – 18. The application still includes claims 11 – 18.

Enclosed herewith is a Petition for Three-Months Extension of Time together with a CC Payment Form covering the extension fee of \$ 555.00.

### OATH/DECLARATION

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the oath or declaration is defective and has required a new oath or declaration. In particular, the Examiner stated that the first and fourth inventors need a new declaration.

With this Amendment, Applicant hereby encloses a new declaration for the fourth invention (Jerry Hamann) and a Petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.47 concerning the first inventor (Pradeep K. Agarwal). Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the declaration be withdrawn.

### RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the section CROSS REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS in the specification is confusing. Therefore, with this Amendment, Applicant has removed the confusing wording.

### REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11 – 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and claims 1 – 14 and 16 – 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

With this Amendment, Applicant has amended the claims to better define the present invention. In particular, claim 11 has been amended to claim a reactant feed stream containing hydrocarbon. The amended claim 11 is supported by paragraphs 22 and 23 describing combining the reactants. Specifically, ammonia and hydrocarbons are combined in the reactor described in paragraphs 33 – 37. Other amendments to claim 11 are in accordance with the Examiner's

comments and further clarify other rejections and the antecedent basis issues in claims 4, 5, and 10. Paragraphs 22, 23, 30, and 39 make it clear to one skilled in the art that there is only one instance of each in the invention and there it can be reasonably ascertained that the meanings in claim 11 are referring only to that instance. Similarly, hydrogen is only removed once from the reaction as shown in paragraph 23. There should be no confusion to what "hydrogen" the claim is referring to.

In addition, claims 12, 14, 16, 17, and 18 have been amended to clarify the claims. Concerning claim 13, it is immaterial to the order of the streams introduced into the reactor and the claims make no reference to the order of introduction. As long as they are both present when the reaction takes place, the order does not matter.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

PRADEEP K. AGARWAL et al

By: 

Emery L. Tracy, Reg. No. 34,081

P.O. Box 1518

Boulder, Colorado 80306

Phone: (303) 443-1143 Fax: (720) 836-4262